



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Book Reviews

The Historic Exodus. By OLAF A. TOFFTEEN, PH.D. Researches in Biblical Archaeology, Vol. II. Published for the Oriental Society of the Western Theological Seminary. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909. Pp. xxii + 339. \$2.50.

The title of this book is a misnomer, for Toffteen contends that there were two Exodi. This, however, is a small matter, and might be overlooked. But the very first sentence of chap. i is a misstatement of fact, viz., "To Professor Wellhausen belongs the distinction of having pointed out that the Hexateuch is made up of *four great documents*, etc." Any beginner in the study of Old Testament criticism should know that Wellhausen was not the originator of this hypothesis. But the misstatement does not stop here, for on p. 12, in summing up the critical position, the author continues, "The Hexateuch consists of four great documents, and four only, which documents are to be found *complete*, if only scholarship is keen enough to detect traces of them, and to assign them to their respective places. The use of the word 'document' presupposes that we deal here with a complete document, and not with mere fragments." No critic holds, nor has one ever held, the view alleged in the first sentence; and in the second sentence a meaning is attached to the word "document" which it has never had in criticism. These two misstatements are constantly referred to in the volume as the views of biblical scholars of the critical school. Surely in criticizing a hypothesis one should correctly represent that hypothesis. Further examples would show that the author has a very imperfect idea of the teachings of modern critical scholarship, in spite of his statement on p. xi of the Preface, "I claim to be thoroughly cognizant of the views of all the more prominent writers bearing upon this work."

Professor Toffteen lays himself open to still more serious criticism by the use he makes of the material of other scholars without giving them proper credit. It is true that he says in the Preface, p. xiv, "In chaps. ii and iii the reader will find that my views often coincide with those of Eerdmans, etc."; but when one turns to these chapters the name of Eerdmans is not mentioned once, although many of his statements are found repeated almost verbatim. For example, in Eerdmans' *Die Komposition der Genesis*, p. 9, we read, "Among all the nations, which the earlier and later strata in Gen. 10 enumerate for us, it is noteworthy that the Persians are missing.

It seems impossible that a writer of the exilic or post-exilic age would pass by a people which for the Israel of that time was the most significant." Compare this with p. 17 of our book, "It seems quite impossible that a man in the time of Ezra (444 B. C.), or more especially Ezra himself, if he were the author of the P document, could have written a table of nations, particularly one of the Aryan nations, without mentioning the Persians, who were in his day rulers of Asia." Again on the same page in Eerdmans' pamphlet we read "The Jews residing in Babylonia knew very well at that time that the Elamites did not belong to the Semites." On p. 18 of Toffteen's book we read, "But in the time of Ezra every Jew living in Babylonia knew that the Elamites were not related to the Semites, either ethnically, geographically, or politically." Other examples occur on Eerdmans p. 30, Toffteen p. 20; Eerdmans p. 5, Toffteen p. 22; Eerdmans p. 8, Toffteen p. 24. The discussion of the ten Toledoth, pp. 50 f., is also based upon Eerdmans' work. When one bears in mind that on these two chapters, ii and iii, depends the main premise of Toffteen's whole argument, viz., that the P document is not post-exilic, the situation becomes still more grave.

The author frequently refers contemptuously to the "assumptions" of the critics and in one place, p. 177, to the "wild-cat theories of the radical critics." Where could one find more assumptions, pure and simple, or more wild theories compressed into a single volume than are contained in this book? But here again it is necessary to be specific, even to go into detail; for our contention is that in this book the author has shown himself neither scholarly nor scientific. Let us investigate his philology first of all. On p. 24, note 3, we have a discussion of the word *El-Shaddai*. "The same god was introduced into the Egyptian pantheon under the name of Set or Sed, which should probably be pronounced Saddai. The center of this worship was at Tanis and Avaris, and the god's totem was the ass, which connects him with the worship of Hadad of the *Amurru* or Amorite people of Syria, the Amorite name itself being the older Canaanite name of *Chamor* or 'he-ass.'" For the first statement there is not a scrap of historical nor philological evidence. The second statement is so vague that one must hesitate to criticize it. What connection can there be between Set or Sed=Saddai=El-Shaddai and Hadad of *Amurru* which name=*Chamor*?

On p. 43 we are informed that the Canaanite tongue mentioned in Isa. 19:18 was Galilean Aramaic. This is certainly new. Where is the evidence? Compare this statement with one on p. 60, "Again, we know of a Galilean dialect at the time of Christ. This dialect existed, in all probability, from very early times." How early? Surely Toffteen does

not mean to tell us that when the rest of the Israelites in Palestine were speaking *Hebrew* the Galileans were speaking Galilean *Aramaic*. Yet when he speaks of the Song of Deborah as written in this dialect it would seem so. Still he insists that the peculiarities of style "should be explained as peculiarities of the Galilean dialect rather than 'Aramaisms.'" Just what does he mean? On p. 59 he discusses the Hebrew dialects. We learn that in the dialect of Benjamin *bosheth* corresponds to *baal* of the Jerusalem dialect. So *mephi* corresponds to *meri*. This thought is developed until, p. 138, we have P written in the dialect of Levi, E and D in the dialect of Ephraim, and J in the dialect of Judah. Where is the evidence for all this? We are told that when *synonyms* are used they indicate difference in dialect. A regularly says "go in," B "enter," ergo A and B speak different dialects! While discussing dialects we may see what arguments are based on this new philology. On p. 60 it is stated that "the peculiarities of vocabulary and style of a document may be ascribed to the peculiar dialect of the tribe which owned it. And if this is the case *we have in the language of the documents no criterion whatever of the comparative ages of those documents.*" The weight of this argument is, unfortunately, not increased by a statement made *nine* lines farther on, "The language of the Toledoth Book is closely related to that of the P document proper, and is therefore also to be assigned to the tribe of Levi. Its minor differences from the rest of P indicate only a *different age in the development of the dialect.* In this case we must assume that it is the older of the two." In this connection the statement made on p. 57 is interesting: "It is assumed by many critics that P is a product of the age of Ezra, even though parts of it may go back to as early as the age of Ezekiel. But if P had been written at that time it *would surely represent the language of Ezra's age.*" But let us return to etymologies and identifications. The Egyptian "Tharu" is the exact Hebrew equivalent of "Shur," and "Khetem"=Etham (p. 158), and the word Sekmem is explained thus: The Greek versions, we are told, in rendering the word which in Hebrew appears as Shechem, offer two readings "so different as to presuppose different originals. One of these is Sychem; the other is Sikima (*a neuter plural*). The Hebrew equivalent of the former is *Shechem*; of the latter, *Shikmim*" (p. 240). The uninitiated should be told that the ending "im" of the last word is the Hebrew plural ending, corresponding to the Greek plural. But the choicest specimens have been reserved for the end of the book. One of the Amarna-letters is discussed on p. 264. A city Tu-mur (-ka) is mentioned. Toffteen does call attention to the fact that Knudtzon, who has given us the last and critical edition of these letters, reads "from

the mountain." But Toffteen prefers the older reading of Winckler and Scheil—for obvious reasons. "Now *tumur* is the Arabic (!) plural of *tamar* meaning 'palm-tree,' and corresponds to the Hebrew plural *temarim*, meaning 'palm-trees,' which at this time was the name of Jericho, Ehud's home." It is difficult to see how an *Arabic* plural of "palm-tree" could be in use in the time of Ehud, according to Toffteen's chronology B.C. 1465–1385 (p. 315), at least a *thousand* years before the Arabs could possibly have pushed into Canaan, and almost *two thousand* years before Arabic actually became the language of this country. On p. 269 we learn that "another part of the biblical history of this time receives confirmation and elucidation from these newly discovered monuments." The reference is to the discoveries of Winckler at Boghaz-köi. In Judg. 3:7–11 Cushan-Rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia, is mentioned. Who was this king? From the new inscriptions found by Winckler, we learn of a "branch of the kingly line, headed by Artatama." Now "the Greek, which, as we have now often said, is usually more accurate than our mutilated Hebrew," renders Cushan-Rishathaim, as Cus-Arsathaim. "The latter half of this name is an exact equivalent of the name Artatama." For "when Hebrew *sh* is a palatal sibilant it is invariably rendered in Aramaic with a *t*." "Now in the inscriptions found at Boghaz-köi, there is mentioned a city in Mitani called Ku-us-sar, which seems the same as the first half of the biblical name, i. e., Cus(ar)." The new philology evidently allows the dropping of such an insignificant letter as *r* at will. "The name of this king, then, long so mysterious, means simply Artatama of Ku-us-(sar). There is no doubt that this 'Cushan-Rishathaim' was Artatama, the Midianite king who ruled over the Horites of southern Palestine." Das mag glauben wer *kann*.

The whole method of the book is totally unreliable. After attempting to prove, mostly by Eerdmans' arguments, that the "higher critical" dates assigned to the documents of the Hexateuch are false, the author begins his own reconstruction of the history by asserting that there were two *Exodi* from Egypt, some hundreds of years apart. The proof presented consists largely of the linguistic arguments we have already discussed. As to the treatment of historical data it is safe to say that there is no scholar of any standing in the scientific world who could possibly agree with the distorted and positively misleading interpretation of the Egyptian and Babylonian monuments which is here presented. The theory of two *Exodi* makes necessary two leaders named Moses, two or more Aarons, two Joshuas. The evidence for the duplicate leaders is admittedly slight, being based upon variant spellings of their names in the Greek version. But the author

should surely have known that on that basis there would be two or more Davids, Solomons—in fact, two or more of every man whose name occurs at all frequently in the Old Testament. The geography, especially the physical geography of the Exodi, as presented by this book is new (p. 162 f.), but the height of the ridiculous is reached on p. 176, where we learn that “The Wilderness of Sin and the wilderness of Sinai are the *oases* of the Arabah, between the Seir-ranges, etc.”

The Documentary Hypothesis, we are told, p. 13, points out the discrepancies, difficulties, and inconsistencies of the Old Testament records, “but it does not *remove*” them. Devout persons therefore “are slow to accept the results of modern criticism.” Having accepted the author’s hypothesis, “the ‘contradictions’ quietly disappear,” and we learn that we are dealing “with varying historical verities” (p. 281). The force of this argument is lost when on p. 279 we read, “We venture, therefore, to believe that the Hexateuchal stories of the Exodus are reliable even to the most minute details, *except where the later compiler of the documents has misunderstood and changed his material, and where the copyists of later ages have miscopied the text or annotated it with their own explanations.*” There is no immediate danger that the hypothesis here presented will necessitate “a total reconstruction of the Evolutionary Hypothesis of modern higher criticism” (p. xii).

D. D. LUCKENBILL

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Background of the Gospels, or Judaism in the period between the Old and New Testaments. By WILLIAM FAIRWEATHER, M.A. Edinburgh: Clark, 1908; imported by Scribner. Pp. 456. \$3.00.

The period covered in this book embraces the two hundred and thirty-five years from the Maccabaeen uprising to the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus. A brief survey of the literary sources of the period is followed by a consideration of the fundamental characteristics of Judaism, which are held to be legalism, religious fellowship, individualism, conservatism, and syncretism. Under the last-named topic is discussed the vexed question of the influence exerted upon Judaism by the religions of Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, and Greece. The influence of Egypt in this respect is regarded as unimportant. The influence of Babylonia, though greater than that of Egypt, was also, in the opinion of the author, of minor significance, not affecting the fundamentals of Judaistic monotheism, but confined rather “to secondary matters as ceremonialism, the visionary method as adopted